



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/836,271	04/18/2001	Susumu Honma	109295	5481

25944 7590 09/11/2003

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. BOX 19928
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320

EXAMINER

HAMILTON, MONPLAISIR G

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2172

DATE MAILED: 09/11/2003

10

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/836,271

Applicant(s)

HONMA ET AL.

Examiner

Monplaisir G Hamilton

Art Unit

2172

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 July 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-15 remain for examination.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 7/22/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants argue "Rheume does not disclose 'table extraction means for extracting the table from the data input form accepted by the data input form acceptance means' as recited in claim 1. Nor does Rheume appear to disclose 'database defining means for defining a database based on the table extracted by the table extraction means', as recited in claim 1. In the first place, Rheume does not extract a table from the data input form accepted by the data input form data acceptance means as claimed. Instead, Rheume extracts underlying data from tables and puts that data in relational database tables. This is not what is recited in claim 1. According to Applicants' claims, a table is input, not just data contained in a table, or data attributes of a table, and the table is extracted, not just data from the table, and a database is defined based on the extracted table. Rheume merely extracts data from the table and defines a database based on the extracted data contained in the table, not based on the extracted table, as recited in the claims."

Examiner disagrees. Applicants' disclosure page 5, lines 1-15; discloses "The data input form constructed as the electronic document data also includes a Web page describe with HTML. The table extraction unit extracts a table from the input data form accepted by the data input acceptance unit. More specifically, the table extraction unit **analyzes layout of the data** input form accepted by the data input acceptance unit and extracts a table included in the data

Art Unit: 2172

input form.... The database-defining unit defines a database based on the table extracted by the table extraction unit. More specifically, the database defining unit defines a database having as a field name, each data piece included in the first row cell of the table extracted by the table extraction unit". Applicant page 11, lines 9-18 discloses that field data is also processed by the extraction means such that field name as well as field data are included in that database.

Rheume discloses col 2, lines 13-26 ~~discloses~~ each table in the HTML page is processed to create a relational database tables. Examiner holds that Rheume discloses the claimed "table extraction means for extracting the table from the data input form accepted by the data input form acceptance means". As disclosed by Applicant, the data input form is described using HTML and the table extraction means analyzes the layout of the data to generate the database tables. Rheume discloses analyzing the web page to determine, the table names, and column names as well table data. Rheume processes a web page that contains tables, extracts all pertinent table information and formalizes a relation table. Examiner therefore holds that Rheume's processing of the HTML page and creating a relational database is equivalent to applicants claimed "table extraction means for extracting the table from the data input form accepted by the data input form acceptance means" and "database defining means for defining a database based on the table extracted by the table extraction means,".

Applicant further argues, "Tamano suffers from the same deficiencies with respect to claims 1-15 as does Rheume. Tamano merely extracts data from the table and defines a database based on the extracted data contained in the table, not based on the extracted table, as recited in the claims. Moreover, Applicants respectfully submit that Tamano does not disclose 'data input form generation means for generating a database-related data input form related with the database by relating the table included in

Art Unit: 2172

the data input form accepted by the data input form acceptance means with the database defined by the database defining means.' Tamano does not relate the table included in the data input form accepted by the data input form acceptance means with the database defined by the database defining means. Instead, Tamano relates data in the table that is input to its system with the database it defines."

Examiner disagrees. Applicant continues to assert that neither Rheume nor Tamano disclose defining a database based on the extracted table. As disclosed by applicant the extracted table is interpreted based on layout information, this is how applicant creates field name and data. Examiner does not see the difference between that claimed invention and the disclosures of Tamano and Rheume. Tamano discloses creating a form that is used for entering data into to database based on link information and image information of a CRF (Form/table information) that is entered by a user (col 3, lines 30-40; col 5, lines 10-25, 43-60;). Essentially Tamano discloses using the image information of a form and link information to generate a database and an input form that is related to the generated database (col 5, lines 55-60; col 7, lines 34-45). Tamano further discloses inputting data into the database via the generated form (col 14, lines 30-60). Examiner therefore holds that Tamano does relate the table included in the data input form accepted by the data input form acceptance means with the database defined by the database defining means.

Finally, in response to applicant's argument that "if the added feature admittedly not in Rheume is added to Rheume, the execution of such an added feature would require additional time and that they are inherent in any computerized database" the fact that applicant has recognized another advantage which would flow naturally from following the suggestion of the prior art cannot be the basis for patentability when the differences would otherwise be obvious.

Art Unit: 2172

See *Ex parte Obiaya*, 227 USPQ 58, 60 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1985). Furthermore, these arguments do not effect the merits of the rejection and do not comply with 37 FR 1.111(c) because they do not clearly point out the patentable novelty which he or she thinks the claims present in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited or the objections made. Further, they do not show how the amendments avoid such references or objections.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

3. Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 6247018 issued to Rheaume, herein referred to as Rheaume in view of US 5930799 issued to Tamano et al, herein referred to as Tamano.

Referring to Claims 1, 6 and 11:

Rheaume discloses a data input form generation system comprising: data input form acceptance means for accepting input of a data input form including a table (col 1, lines 50-55; col 4, lines 37-45); table extraction means for extracting the table from the data input form accepted by the data input form acceptance means (col 2, lines 14-50); database defining means for defining a database based on the table extracted by the table extraction means (col 2 MH 6/03/2003, 15-27);

Art Unit: 2172

Rheaume does not explicitly disclose "data input form generation means for generating a database-related data input form related with the database by relating the table included in the data input form accepted by the data input form acceptance means with the database defined by the database defining means."

Tamano discloses data input form generation means for generating a database-related data input form related with the database by relating the table included in the data input form accepted by the data input form acceptance means with the database defined by the database defining means (col 3, lines 25-30; 50-57).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Rheaume such that an input form can be used to insert data into the generated database. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because it would allow a user quickly input new value into the database.

Referring to Claims 2, 7 and 12:

Rheaume in view of Tamano disclose the limitation as discussed in Claims 1, 6 and 11 above. Rheaume discloses the database defining means has, as a field name of the database, data included in a first-row cell of the table extracted by the table extraction means (col 5, lines 60-65).

Referring to Claims 3, 8 and 13:

Rheaume in view of Tamano disclose the limitation as discussed in Claim 1 above. Rheaume discloses the database defining means has, as a field name of the database, data

Art Unit: 2172

included in a first-column cell of the table extracted by the table extraction means (col 2, lines 15-30).

Referring to Claims 4, 9 and 14:

Rheume in view of Tamano disclose the limitation as discussed in Claim 1 above.

Rheume discloses the data input form acceptance means accepts input of the data input form configured as electronic document data (col 1, lines 50-65).

Referring to Claims 5, 10, and 15:

Rheume in view of Tamano disclose the limitation as discussed in Claim 1 above.

Rheume discloses the data input form acceptance means accepts input of the data input form recorded onto a recording sheet (col 1, lines 50-65).

Art Unit: 2172

Final Rejection

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.


Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Monplaisir G Hamilton whose telephone number is 1703-305-5116. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday (8:00 am - 4:30 pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Y Vu can be reached on 1703-305-4393. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 1703-305-3900.

Monplaisir Hamilton


KIM VU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100